

***Remarks***

Reconsideration of this Application is respectfully requested.

Upon entry of the foregoing amendment, claims 1-4, 7-13, 16-22, and 25-30 are pending in the application, with 1, 10, 19, and 28-30 being the independent claims. Claims 1, 3, 4, 7-10, 12, 13, 16-19, 21, 22, and 25-27 are amended. Claims 5, 6, 14, 15, 23, and 24 are sought to be canceled without prejudice to or disclaimer of the subject matter therein. New claims 28-30 are sought to be added. These changes are believed to introduce no new matter, and their entry is respectfully requested.

Based on the above amendment and the following remarks, Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner reconsider all outstanding objections and rejections and that they be withdrawn.

***Allowable Subject Matter***

Applicants acknowledge with appreciation the Examiner's indication that claims 9, 18, and 27 contain allowable subject matter. Accordingly, claims 9, 18, and 27 have been rewritten in independent form as new claims 28-30, respectively. Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner acknowledge the allowance of these claims.

***Information Disclosure Statements***

In paragraph 3, on page 2 of the Office Action, the Office Action states an IDS filed by Applicants on 9/19/01 failed to comply with the provisions of 37 C.F.R. § 1.97, 1.98, and M.P.E.P. § 609 because for references AR2, AT9, AR11, AR18, AT18, AT23, AS27, AT29, AR30, AT31, AT34, AS36, and AR37, pertinent pages are not listed.

Upon review of 37 C.F.R. § 1.97, 1.98, and M.P.E.P. § 609, Applicants have failed to find a requirement to list pertinent pages of these references. 37 C.F.R. § 1.97 is silent as to this issue, and both 37 C.F.R. § 1.98 and M.P.E.P. § 609 state that a legible copy is required of "(ii) Each publication or that portion which caused it to be listed . . . ."

Applicants have provided a legible copy of each of the above noted publications, and thus believe they have complied with the applicable portions of 37 C.F.R. § 1.97, 1.98, and M.P.E.P. § 609. Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner please provide an indication of an applicable rule supporting the position presented in the Office Action so that Applicants can have the opportunity to comply. Otherwise, Applicants assume they have complied with the applicable portions of 37 C.F.R. § 1.97, 1.98, and M.P.E.P. § 609 with respect to references AR2, AT9, AR11, AR18, AT18, AT23, AS27, AT29, AR30, AT31, AT34, AS36, and AR37.

Applicants acknowledge with appreciation the Examiner's consideration of the documents submitted with Information Disclosure Statements on April 3, 2002, August 21, 2003, February 5, 2004, and August 31, 2004.

### ***Objections to the Drawings***

In paragraph 5 on page 3 of the Office Action, the drawings were objected to because the Examiner "had a hard time locating all reference numbers and objects on FIG 1 due to the clustering of all objects and numbers positioned together," among other things. Accordingly, Applicants submit herewith 23 replacement drawing sheets that replace all of the originally filed drawings. The 23 replacement drawing sheets present

all of the originally filed drawings in a clean, professional manner. Thus, Applicants respectfully request that this objection be reconsidered and withdrawn.

In paragraph 6 on page 4 of the Office Action, the drawings were objected to because the reference character 100 of FIG. 1B was not mentioned in the description. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit a replacement drawing sheet herewith in which the reference character "100" is replaced with "104" in FIG. 1B. An annotated drawing sheet showing the change in red ink is also submitted herewith. Thus, Applicants respectfully request that the objection be reconsidered and withdrawn.

In paragraph 6 on page 4 of the Office Action, the drawings were further objected to because the reference characters 106F2 (actually 206F2) of FIG. 2F2, 206E2, 206G2, and 206J2 of FIG. 2F2, and 207E and 207G of FIG. 2G were not mentioned in the description. Accordingly, Applicants have amended the specification in response to this objection to include those reference characters in the description. Thus, Applicants respectfully request that the objection be reconsidered and withdrawn.

In paragraph 6 on page 4 of the Office Action, the drawings were further objected to because the reference character 206H2 was not mentioned in the description. Applicants respectfully submit that 206H2 is mentioned at least on page 40, line 13 of the description. Thus, Applicants respectfully request that the objection be reconsidered and withdrawn.

***Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 112***

On page 5 of the Office Action, claims 1, 3-5, 9, 10, 12-14, 18, 19, 21-23, and 27 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to

particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. The Examiner stated that the term “mutable” would be viewed as changeable throughout the Office Action. Applicants have removed the term mutable from the claims, to more broadly and clearly recited the claimed subject matter, making this rejection moot. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the rejection be reconsidered and withdrawn.

***Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 102***

In paragraph 12 on page 5 of the Office Action, claims 1-3, 10-12, and 19-21 were rejected under 32 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,925,595 to Whitledge et al. (hereinafter Whitledge). Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection, and request that it be withdrawn.

Differences exist between Whitledge and the claimed embodiments of the present invention. For example claim 1 recites the following:

1. A method of structuring interactive content for mobile devices, comprising the steps of:
  - determining layout and rendering parameters based on mobile device information;
  - parsing requested content into a document having a format based on at least said layout and rendering parameters;
  - generating document content on an object-by-object basis from said document;
  - generating a document table based on said object-by-object basis for said document;
  - serializing said document content into a content stream according to said object-by-object basis;
  - serializing said document table into said content stream according to said object-by-object basis; and
  - transmitting said content stream to a mobile device;wherein the serialized document table contains at least one pointer to object data in the content stream.

Whitledge does not teach or suggest all of these features of claim 1. For example, Whitledge does not teach a serialized document table that contains at least one pointer to object data in the content stream, as recited in claim 1.

First, Whitledge does not teach or suggest a serialized document table that contains at least one pointer to object data in a content stream. In column 24, lines 35-40, Whitledge states that “[r]eferences to the selected hypertext elements are saved in a symbol table so they can be used in other expressions and/or a document template.” Nowhere does Whitledge teach or suggest that this symbol table includes at least one pointer to object data in a content stream, as recited in claim 1.

In fact, Whitledge does not even teach or even suggest serializing a document table into a content stream, as recited in claim 1. Nowhere does Whitledge teach or even suggest serializing the symbol table.

Still further, nowhere does Whitledge teach or even suggest transmitting the content stream (which includes the serialized document table) to a mobile device. Nowhere does Whitledge teach or even suggest transmitting the symbol table to a mobile device.

Thus, for at least these reasons, Whitledge does not teach or suggest a serialized document table that contains at least one pointer to object data in a content stream, as recited in claim 1. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that claim 1 is patentable over Whitledge for at least these reasons. Furthermore, independent claims 10 and 19 are also patentable over Whitledge for similar reasons, and further in view of their own features. Claims 2 and 3, which depend from claim 1, claims 11 and 12, which depend from claim 10, and claims 20 and 21, which depend from claim 19, are also patentable

over Whitledge for at least the reasons regarding their respective independent claim, and further in view of their own features. Thus, Applicants respectfully request that the rejection of claims 1-3, 10-12, and 19-21 be reconsidered and withdrawn.

***Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103***

In paragraph 15 on Page 8 of the Office Action, claims 4, 13, and 22 were rejected under 32 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Whitledge, as applied to claim 1, 10 and 19 above, in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,665,709 to Barron (hereinafter Barron). Claim 4 depends directly on claim 1, claim 13 depends directly on claim 10 and claim 22 depends directly on claim 19. The disclosure of Barron adds nothing to the disclosure of Whitledge to overcome the deficiencies of the latter with respect to claims 1, 10, and 19. Claims 4, 13, and 22 are therefore patentable over Whitledge and Barron, alone or in any rational combination, for at least the same reasons as claims 1, 10, and 19, and further in view of their own features. Accordingly, Applicants request that this rejection be reconsidered and withdrawn, and that claims 4, 13 and 22 be passed to allowance.

In paragraph 16 on Page 9 of the Office Action, claims 5-8, 14-17, and 23-26 were rejected under 32 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Whitledge, as applied to claim 1, 10 and 19 above, in view of Barron and U.S. Patent No. 6,671,853 to Burkett et al. (hereinafter Burkett). Claims 6 and 8 depend on claim 1, claims 16 and 17 depend on claim 10, and claims 25 and 26 depend on claim 27. The disclosures of Barron and Burkett add nothing to the disclosure of Whitledge to overcome the deficiencies of the latter with respect to claims 1, 10, and 27. Claims 7, 8, 16, 17, 25, and 26 are therefore

patentable over Whitley, Barron, and Burkett alone or in any rational combination, for at least the same reasons as claims 1, 10, and 19, and further in view of their own features. Claims 5, 6, 14, 15, 23, and 24 were canceled above. Accordingly, Applicants request that this rejection be reconsidered and withdrawn, and that claims 7, 8, 16, 17, 25, and 26 be passed to allowance.


***Conclusion***

All of the stated grounds of objection and rejection have been properly traversed, accommodated, or rendered moot. Applicants therefore respectfully request that the Examiner reconsider all presently outstanding objections and rejections and that they be withdrawn. Applicants believe that a full and complete reply has been made to the outstanding Office Action and, as such, the present application is in condition for allowance. If the Examiner believes, for any reason, that personal communication will expedite prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at the number provided.

Prompt and favorable consideration of this Amendment and Reply is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

STERNE, KESSLER, GOLDSTEIN & FOX P.L.L.C.

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "J. S. Weaver", followed by a horizontal line.

Jeffrey S. Weaver  
Attorney for Applicants  
Registration No. 45,608

Date: 10-5-06

1100 New York Avenue, N.W.  
Washington, D.C. 20005-3934  
(202) 371-2600

534172\_1.DOC



104  
 100




FIG. 1B